

REMARKS

In view of new grounds of rejection, the pending Office Action has been made final. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 4, 9 through 15, 20 through 26, 31 through 37 and 42 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Martin in combination with Kanakubo.

The Applicant has appreciated guidance on the Applicant's proposed amendment during a telephonic interview on January 28, 2009. As discussed during the interview, the above claim amendments have been made to distinguish the patentable features over the disclosure in the cited prior art references. As will be detailed below, because of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending objections and rejections.

The Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 4, 9 through 15, 20 through 26, 31 through 37 and 42 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Martin and Kanakubo.

Since independent claim 1 has been already cancelled, the rejection of independent claim 1 appears moot.

Newly amended independent claims 34, 45, 46 and 47 are supported by the original disclosure of the current application, and no new matter has been introduced to the current application. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner to enter these new independent claims.

With respect to rejected independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 34, the Examiner has alleged that the Martin et al. reference discloses substantially every aspect of the subject matter limitations although another cited reference has been combined in the same rejections. Although the Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection basis, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending rejections in view of the patentable features to the newly amended independent claims.

Newly amended independent claims 45 and 46 now each explicitly recite "preventing the received abnormal condition information from being notified to an operator of the management apparatus if : 1) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a first predetermined amount of time t1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, but 2) the power activation report has been received within the first predetermined amount of time t1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, wherein the received abnormal condition information will be notified to the operator of the management apparatus if : A) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a second predetermined amount of time t2 since the reception of the power activation report."

Similarly, newly amended independent claim 34 now each explicitly recites "an abnormal condition notifying unit connected to said abnormal condition removal determination unit for preventing to notify a center operator the abnormal condition information when 1) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a first predetermined amount of time t1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, but 2) the power activation report has been received within the first predetermined amount of time t1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, wherein said abnormal condition notifying unit will notify the center operator of the abnormal

condition information if : A) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a second predetermined amount of time t_2 since the reception the power activation report.”

Lastly, newly amended independent claim 47 now each explicitly recites “a power activation report receiving unit for receiving the power activation report, wherein the received abnormal condition information will not be notified to an operator of the management apparatus if : 1) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a first predetermined amount of time t_1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, but 2) the power activation report has been received within the first predetermined amount of time t_1 since the reception of the abnormal condition information at the management apparatus, wherein the received abnormal condition information will be notified to the operator of the management apparatus if : A) the corresponding abnormal condition removal information has not been received within a second predetermined amount of time t_2 since the reception of the power activation.”

The Examiner has pointed out column 9 and column 10 of the Martin et al. reference for allegedly disclosing the subject matter of the independent claims. The Examiner has described some of the allegations on page 4 of the Office Action with respect to the notification function of the current invention. In this regard, the Examiner has stated that the Martin reference discloses a first event E to activate a first timer and a second event E' to stop the first timer while the second event also restart a second timer. Although the Examiner attempted to explain the above relationship between the timers and the events of the Martin reference, the disclosed relationship of the Martin reference is irrelevant to the claimed notification feature of newly amended independent claims 34, 45, 46 and 47.

As quoted above, independent claims 34 and 45 through 47 calls for two situations wherein a notification of the abnormal condition is prevented from being notified to an operator under a certain first set of specific conditions while the same notification of the abnormal condition is notified to an operator under a certain second set of specific conditions. Although two time periods are used in relation to the specific conditions, the above quoted patentable features of the independent claims are no longer limited to the lack of the notification.

Even if the cited prior art references are combined as the Examiner has proposed, the combined disclosure still fails to teach, disclose or suggest the above quoted patentable feature of the current invention. As explicitly recited in independent claims 34, 45, 46 and 47, a notification is NOT provided under a first set of conditions while a notification is provided under a second set of conditions. In particular, if the power activation is reported within the first predetermined amount of time t_1 even though the abnormal condition removal information for the underlying abnormal condition has not been received, the abnormal condition information will not be notified to the operator. On the other hand, if the abnormal condition removal information for the underlying abnormal condition has not been received within the second predetermined amount of time t_2 since the power activation is reported, the abnormal condition information will be notified to the operator. In any case, the newly amended independent claims each explicitly recite "the abnormal condition information including the corresponding abnormal condition type for causing to fail a predetermined non-communication function in the managed apparatus."

In sharp contrast, the Martin prior art reference discloses only communication-related functions and specific paired events. As disclosed in column 7, the Martin prior art reference discloses Events 1 through 5 are related to communication among the devices but fails to disclose, teach or suggest separate and additional underlying normal conditions that are not related to communication among the devices. Furthermore, as

disclosed at lines 53 through 65, the level 1 and 2 events are always displayed or notified in the first par of the flow chart in Figure 3 regardless of conditions. On the other hand, as disclosed at line 66, column 10 through line 4, column 4, the level 2 and 3 events are not displayed or notified. In addition, as disclosed at lines 5 though 36, column 11, the Martin prior art reference discloses that unless a current event is not corresponding to a previously occurred event as specified in the variable B, the current event is not displayed or notified. One example of the disclosed paired events is Events 1 and 1A. In this regard, after a "Configuration Start" event 1 is registered in the variable B, if a subsequent event is the pairing "Configuration Finish" event 1', then the subsequent event 1' is notified or displayed.

The above disclosure is quite contrary to the claimed invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims. The newly amended independent claims positively recite the condition that "the abnormal condition information" is notified is when "the abnormal condition removal information" is not received within "the second predetermined amount of time t2" after "the power activation report" is received. "[T]he abnormal condition" causes "to fail a predetermined non-communication function in the managed apparatus." However, the newly amended independent claims positively recite that "the abnormal condition information" is prevented from being notified when "the abnormal condition removal information" is not received but "the power activation report" is received within "the first predetermined amount of time t1." Since these two sets of specific conditions are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references alone or combination, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the above patentable features as explicitly recited in independent claims 34, 45, 46 and 47 based upon the cited references.

Dependent claims 2 through 4, 9 through 11, 13 through 15, 20 through 22, 24 through 26, 31 through 33, 35 through 37 and 42 through 44 ultimately depend from newly amended independent claim 45, 46, 47 or 34 and incorporate the above discussed

patentable features of the current invention. Based upon the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner that the pending section 103 rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

/KEN I. YOSHIDA/

Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.

Reg. No. 37,009

Date: January 30, 2009

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC
Customer No. 21302
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 599-0600